arXiv:1405.3097v2 [cs.DM] 23 May 2014

# Computer-Aided Proof of Erdős Discrepancy Properties

Boris Konev and Alexei Lisitsa
Liverpool University

**Abstract**

In 1930s Paul Erdős conjectured that for any positive integer $C$ in any infinite $\pm 1$ sequence $(x_n)$ there exists a subsequence $x_d, x_{2d}, x_{3d}, \ldots, x_{kd}$, for some positive integers $k$ and $d$, such that $|\sum_{i=1}^{k} x_{i\cdot d}| > C$. The conjecture has been referred to as one of the major open problems in combinatorial number theory and discrepancy theory. For the particular case of $C = 1$ a human proof of the conjecture exists; for $C = 2$ a bespoke computer program had generated sequences of length $1124$ of discrepancy 2, but the status of the conjecture remained open even for such a small bound. We show that by encoding the problem into Boolean satisfiability and applying the state of the art SAT solvers, one can obtain a discrepancy 2 sequence of length $1160$ and a *proof* of the Erdős discrepancy conjecture for $C = 2$, claiming that no discrepancy 2 sequence of length $1161$, or more, exists. In the similar way, we obtain a precise bound of $127\,645$ on the maximal lengths of both multiplicative and completely multiplicative sequences of discrepancy 3.

## 1 Introduction

Discrepancy theory is a branch of mathematics dealing with irregularities of distributions of points in some space in combinatorial, measure-theoretic and geometric settings [Beck and Chen, 1987; Chazelle, 2000; Matoušek, 1999; Beck and Sós, 1995]. The paradigmatic combinatorial discrepancy theory problem can be described in terms of a hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (U, S)$, that is, a set $U$ and a family of its subsets $S \subseteq 2^U$. Consider a colouring $c : U \to \{+1, -1\}$ of the elements of $U$ in *blue* $(+1)$ and *red* $(-1)$ colours. Then one may ask whether there exists a colouring of the elements of $U$ such that colours are distributed uniformly in every element of $S$ or a discrepancy of colours is always inevitable. Formally, the discrepancy (deviation from a uniform distribution) of a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ is defined as $\min_c(\max_{s\in S} |\sum_{e\in s} c(e)|)$. Discrepancy theory has found applications in computational complexity [Chazelle, 2000], complexity of communication [Alon, 1992] and differential privacy [Muthukrishnan and Nikolov, 2012].

One of the oldest problems of discrepancy theory is the discrepancy of hypergraphs over sets of natural numbers with the subsets (hyperedges) forming arithmetical progressions over these sets [Matoušek and Spencer, 1996]. Roth's theorem [Roth, 1964], one of the main results in the area, states that for the hypergraph formed by the arithmetic progressions in $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, that is $\mathcal{H}_n = (U_n, S_n)$, where $U_n = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$

and elements of $S_n$ being of the form $(ai + b)$ for arbitrary $a, b$, the discrepancy grows at least as $\frac{1}{20}n^{1/4}$.

Surprisingly, for the more restricted case of *homogeneous* arithmetic progressions of the form $(ai)$, the question of the discrepancy bounds is open for more than eighty years. In 1930s Paul Erdős conjectured [Erdős, 1957] that discrepancy is unbounded. Independently the same conjecture has been raised by [Čudakov, 1956]. Proving or disproving this conjecture became one of the major open problems in combinatorial number theory and discrepancy theory. It has been referred to as the *Erdős discrepancy problem* (EDP) [Beck and Chen, 1987; Beck and Sós, 1995; Nikolov and Talwar, 2013].

The expected value of the discrepancy of random $\pm 1$ sequences of length $n$ grows as $n^{1/2+o(1)}$ and the explicit constructions of a sequence with slowly growing discrepancy at the rate of $\log_3 n$ have been demonstrated [Gowers, 2013; Borwein *et al.*, 2010]. By considering cases, one can see that any $\pm 1$ sequence containing 12 or more elements has discrepancy at least 2; that is, Erdős's conjecture holds for the particular case $C = 1$ (also implied by a stronger result of Mathias [1993]). Until recently the status of the conjecture remained unknown for all other values of $C$. Although widely believed not to be the case, there was still a possibility that an infinite sequence of discrepancy 2 existed.

The conjecture whether the discrepancy of an arbitrary $\pm 1$ sequence is unbounded is equivalent to the question whether the discrepancy of a completely multiplicative $\pm 1$ sequence is unbounded, where a sequence is completely multiplicative if $x_{m \cdot n} = x_m \cdot x_n$ for any $m, n$ [Erdős, 1957]. For completely multiplicative sequences the choices of how the sequence can be constructed are severely limited as the entire sequence is defined by the values of $x_i$ for prime $i$. The longest completely multiplicative sequence of discrepancy 2 has length $246$ [Polymath, 2011]. For discrepancy 3 the bound was not known.

The EDP has attracted renewed interest in 2009-2010 as it became a topic of the fifth Polymath project [2010] a widely publicised endeavour in collective math initiated by T. Gowers [2009]. As part of this activity an attempt has been made to attack the problem using computers (see discussion in [Polymath, 2010]). A purposely written computer program had successfully found $\pm 1$ sequences of length $1124$ and discrepancy 2; however, no further progress has been made leading to a claim "given how long a finite sequence can be, it seems unlikely that we could answer this question just by a clever search of all possibilities on a computer" [Polymath, 2010].

The status of the Erdős discrepancy conjecture for $C = 2$ has been settled by the authors of this article [Konev and Lisitsa, 2014a], [Konev and Lisitsa, 2014b] by reduction to SAT. The method is based on establishing the correspondence between $\pm 1$ sequences that violate a given discrepancy bound and words accepted by of a finite automaton. Traces of this automaton are represented then by a propositional formula and state of the art SAT solvers are used to prove that the longest $\pm 1$ sequence of discrepancy 2 contains $1160$ elements. A $13\,900$ long $\pm 1$ sequence of discrepancy 3 was also constructed.

This article is a revised and extended version of [Konev and Lisitsa, 2014b]. We use a different smaller SAT encoding of the Erdős discrepancy problem, which is based

on the sequential counter encoding of the *at most* cardinality constraints[1]. The impact of the new encoding is twofold. Firstly, it allows us to significantly reduce the size of the machine-generated proof of the fact that any sequence longer than $1160$ has discrepancy at least $3$. Secondly, by combining the new encoding with additional restrictions that the sequence is multiplicative, or completely multiplicative, we improve significantly the lower bound on the length of sequences of discrepancy $3$. We prove the surprising result that $127\,645$, the length of the longest completely multiplicative sequence of discrepancy $3$, is also the maximal length of a multiplicative sequence of discrepancy $3$, which is not the case for $C = 1$ and $C = 2$. The article also contains detailed argumentation, examples and complete proofs.

The article is organised as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the main terms and definition. In Section 3 we describe the new SAT encoding of the Erdős discrepancy problem. Results and conclusions are discussed in Sections 4 and 5 respectively. To improve readability a number of technical proofs have been deferred to an appendix.

# 2 Preliminaries

We divide this section into three parts: main definitions for the Erdős discrepancy problem, some background and definitions for SAT solving, and sequential counter-based SAT encoding of cardinality constraints.

Since number $1$ is used both as an element of $\pm 1$ sequences and as the logical value *true*, to avoid confusion, in what follows we write $1$ to refer to the logical value *true* and $+1$ to refer to elements of $\pm 1$ sequences. We also use the following naming convention: we write $x_1, \ldots x_n$ for $\pm 1$ sequences, $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ for sequences of propositions, and $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ for $0/1$ Boolean sequences.

## 2.1 Discrepancy of $\pm 1$ Sequences

A $\pm 1$ sequence of length $n$ is a function $\{1, \ldots, n\} \to \{-1, +1\}$. An infinite $\pm 1$ sequence is a function $\mathbb{N}^+ \to \{1, -1\}$, where $\mathbb{N}^+$ is the set of positive natural numbers. We write $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ to denote a finite $\pm 1$ sequence of length $n$, and $(x_n)$ to denote an infinite sequence. We refer to the $i$-th element of a sequence $x$, that is the value of $x(i)$, as $x_i$. A (finite or infinite) $\pm 1$ sequence $x$ is *completely multiplicative* [Apostol, 1976] if

$$x_{m \cdot n} = x_m \cdot x_n, \text{ for all } m, n \in \mathbb{N}^+. \tag{1}$$

The sequence is *multiplicative* if (1) is only required for coprime $m$ and $n$.

It is easy to see that a sequence $x$ is completely multiplicative if, and only if, $x_1 = +1$ and for the canonical representation $m = \prod_{i=1}^{k} {p_i}^{\alpha_i}$, where $p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_k$ are primes and $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{N}^+$, we have $x_m = \prod_{i=1}^{k} (x_{p_i})^{\alpha_i}$. This observation leads to a more computationally friendly definition of completely multiplicative sequences: $x$ is completely multiplicative if, and only if,

$$\begin{array}{l} x_1 = +1 \text{ and for every composite } m \text{ we have } x_m = x_i \cdot x_j, \text{ for } \textit{some } i \\ \text{and } j, \text{ non-trivial divisors of } m. \end{array} \tag{2}$$

[1] We are grateful to Donald E. Knuth for pointing us in that direction.

The Erdős discrepancy problem can be naturally described in terms of $\pm 1$ sequences (and this is how Erdős himself introduced it [1957]). Erdős's conjecture states that for any $C > 0$ in any infinite $\pm 1$ sequence $(x_n)$ there exists a subsequence $x_d, x_{2d}, x_{3d}, \ldots, x_{kd}$, for some positive integers $k$ and $d$, such that $|\sum_{i=1}^{k} x_{i \cdot d}| > C$.

The general definition of discrepancy given above can be specialised in this case as follows. The discrepancy of a finite $\pm 1$ sequence $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ of length $n$ can be defined as $\max_{d=1,\ldots,n}(|\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{d} \rfloor} x_{i \cdot d}|)$. For an infinite sequence $(x_n)$ its discrepancy is the supremum of discrepancies of all its initial finite fragments.

**Example 1.** *It is easy to see why any $\pm 1$ sequence containing $12$ elements has discrepancy at least $2$. For the proof of contradiction, suppose that the discrepancy of some $\pm 1$ sequence $x_1, \ldots, x_{12}$ is $1$. Assume that $x_1$ is $+1$. We write*

$$(+1, _, _, _, _, _, _, _, _, _, _, _)$$

*to track progress in this example, that is, we put specific values $+1$ or $-1$ into positions $i : 1 \leq i \leq 12$, to indicate decisions on $x_i$ which have been taken so far, and mark positions $x_i$, for which no decision has been made by an underscore.*

*Notice that $x_2$ must be $-1$ for otherwise $x_1 + x_2 = 2$. So, we progress to*

$$(+1, -1, _, _, _, _, _, _, _, _, _, _).$$

*Then the $4$th element of the sequence must be $+1$ for otherwise for $d = 2$ the sum $x_d + x_{2d} = x_2 + x_4 = -2$. So we progress to*

$$(+1, -1, _, +1, _, _, _, _, _, _, _, _).$$

*Then the $3$rd element of the sequence must be $-1$ for otherwise $x_1 + \cdots + x_4 = 2$ and so we come to*

$$(+1, -1, -1, +1, _, _, _, _, _, _, _, _).$$

*Repeating the reasoning above for $x_3$ and $x_6$ followed by $x_5$, for $x_4$ and $x_8$ followed by $x_7$, for $x_5$ and $x_{10}$ followed by $x_9$ and finally for $x_6$ and $x_{12}$ followed by $x_{11}$ we progress to*

$$(+1, -1, -1, +1, -1, +1, +1, -1, -1, +1, +1, -1). \tag{3}$$

*But then for $d = 3$ we have $x_d + x_{2d} + x_{3d} + x_{4d} = x_3 + x_6 + x_9 + x_{12} = -2$. So we derive a contradiction. It can be checked in a similar way that the other possibility of $x_1$ being $-1$ also leads to a contradiction.*

*The first eleven elements of the sequence (3) form a discrepancy $1$ sequence. It is multiplicative but not completely multiplicative as $x_9$ is $-1$. Reasoning similar to the one above shows that there exists a unique longest completely multiplicative $\pm 1$ sequence of discrepancy $1$ which has nine elements:*

$$(+1, -1, -1, +1, -1, +1, +1, -1, +1).$$

## 2.2 Propositional Satisfiability Problem

We assume standard definitions for propositional logic (see, for example, [Rautenberg, 2010]). Propositional formulae are defined over Boolean constants *true* and *false*, denoted by $1$ and $0$, respectively, and the set of Boolean variables (or propositions) $PV$ as follows: Boolean constants $0$ and $1$, as well as the elements of $PV$, are formulae; if $\Phi$ and $\Psi$ are formulae then so are $\Phi \wedge \Psi$ (conjunction), $\Phi \vee \Psi$ (disjunction), $\Phi \rightarrow \Psi$ (implication), $\Phi \leftrightarrow \Psi$ (equivalence) and $\neg\Phi$ (negation). We typically use letters $p$, $q$ and $s$ to denote propositions and capital Greek letters $\Phi$ and $\Psi$ to denote propositional formulae. Whenever necessary, subscripts and superscripts are used. We use $\mathrm{vars}(\Phi)$ to denote the set of all propositions occurring in the formula $\Phi$.

Every propositional formula can be reduced to conjunctive normal form. Propositions and negations of propositions are called *literals*. When the negation is applied to a literal, double negations are implicitly removed, that is, if $l$ is $\neg p$ then $\neg l$ is $p$. A disjunction of literals is called a *clause*. A clause containing exactly one literal is called a unit clause. A conjunction of clauses is called a propositional formula in *conjunctive normal form*, a CNF formula for short. A clause can be represented by the set of its literals and the empty clause correspond to $0$ (*false*). A CNF formula can be represented by the set its clauses. These representations are used interchangeably. We typically use meaningful terms typeset in sans serif font, for example edp or cmult, to highlight the fact that a propositional formula is a CNF formula of interest.

For a propositional formula $\Phi$, we write $\Phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ to indicate that $\{p_1, \ldots, p_n\} \subseteq \mathrm{vars}(\Phi)$. Propositions $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ are designated as 'input' propositions in this case, and the intended meaning is that formula $\Phi$ encodes some property of $p_1, \ldots, p_n$. Then the expression $\Phi(q_1, \ldots, q_n)$ denotes the result of simultaneous replacement of every occurrence of $p_i$ in $\Phi$ with $q_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$.

The semantics of propositional formulae is given by interpretations (also termed assignments). An interpretation $I$ is a mapping $PV \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ extended to literals, clauses, CNF formulae and propositional formulae in general in the usual way. For an assignment $I$ and a formula $\Phi$ we say that $I$ satisfies $\Phi$ (or $I$ is a model of $\Phi$) if $I(\Phi) = 1$. A formula $\Phi$ is satisfiable if there exists an assignment that satisfies it, and unsatisfiable otherwise.

Despite the non-tractability of the satisfiability problem, the tremendous progress in recent years made it possible to solve many interesting hard problems by first expressing them as a propositional formula and then using a SAT solver for obtaining a solution [Biere *et al.*, 2009]. In addition to returning a satisfying assignment, if the input formula is satisfiable, some SAT solvers are also capable to return a proof (or certificate) of unsatisfiability.

Reverse Unit Propagation (RUP) proofs constitute a compact representation of the resolution refutation of the given formula [Goldberg and Novikov, 2003] in the following sense. *Unit propagation* is a CNF formula transformation technique, which simplifies the formula by fixing the values of propositions occurring to its unit clauses to satisfy these clauses. That is, if the unit clause $(p)$ occurs in the CNF formula then all occurrences of $p$ are replaced by $1$ and if the unit clause $(\neg p)$ occurs in the CNF formula, all occurrences of $p$ are replaced by $0$. Then the CNF formula is simplified in the obvious way. A clause $C = (l_1, \ldots l_m)$ is a RUP inference from the input

CNF formula $\Psi$ if adding the unit clauses $(\neg l_1), \ldots, (\neg l_m)$ to $\Psi$ makes the whole formula refutable by unit propagation. A RUP unsatisfiability certificate is the sequence of clauses $C_1, \ldots C_m$ such that for every $1 \leq i \leq m$ the clause $C_i$ is a RUP inference from $\Psi \cup \{C_1, \ldots, C_{i-1}\}$ and $C_m$ is the empty clause. Every unsatisfiable CNF formula has a RUP unsatisfiability certificate [Goldberg and Novikov, 2003].

Delete Reverse Unit Propagation (DRUP) proofs extend RUP proofs by including extra information about the proof search process, namely clauses that have been discarded by the solver. Eliminating this extra information from a DRUP proof converts it to a valid RUP proof. DRUP proofs are somewhat longer but they are significantly faster to verify than a RUP proof [Heule *et al.*, 2013].

## 2.3 Sequential Counter-Based SAT Encoding of Cardinality Constraints

Cardinality constraints [Roussel and Manquinho, 2009] are expressions that impose restrictions on interpretations by specifying numerical bounds on the number of propositions, from a fixed set of propositions, that can be assigned value 1. The *at most* $r$ constraint over the set of propositions $\{p_1, \ldots, p_n\}$, written as $p_1 + \cdots + p_n \leq r$, holds for an interpretation $I$ if, and only if, at most $r$ propositions among $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ are true under $I$.

A SAT encoding for cardinality constraints of the form $p_1 + \cdots + p_n \leq r$ based on a sequential counter circuit has been suggested by Sinz [2005]. In this encoding, auxiliary propositions $s^k_j$ are introduced to represent a unary counter storing the partial sums of prefixes of $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ so that whenever $\sum_{i=1}^{j} p_i \geq k$, for some $j \leq n$, we have $s^k_j = 1$.

We slightly simplify the presentation of [Sinz, 2005] as follows. Let formula $\Phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ be the conjunction of

$$s^k_j \leftrightarrow (s^k_{j-1} \vee (s^{k-1}_{j-1} \wedge p_j)), \qquad \text{for all } 1 \leq k \leq n,\ 1 \leq j \leq n; \tag{4}$$

$$(\neg s^k_j), \qquad \text{for all } 0 \leq j < k \leq n; \tag{5}$$

$$(s^k_j), \qquad \text{for } k = 0 \text{ and all } 0 \leq j \leq n. \tag{6}$$

Recall that we write $\Phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ to highlight the fact that $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ are designated 'input' propositions; the set of all propositions of $\Phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ is $\mathrm{vars}(\Phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n)) = \{p_1, \ldots, p_n\} \cup \bigcup_{k=1}^{n} \bigcup_{j=1}^{n} \{s^k_j\}$.

Notice that instead of including formulae (5) and (6) explicitly in the encoding, one can directly modify (4) by replacing all occurrences of $s^k_j$, for $0 \leq j < k \leq n$, with 0 (the truth value *false*) and all occurrences of $s^k_j$, for $k = 0$ and all $0 \leq j \leq n$, with 1 (the truth value *true*). Then, for example, for $k = j = 1$ formula (4) simplifies to $s^1_1 \leftrightarrow p_1$. We write (5) and (6) explicitly for the exposition purposes.

The proof of the following statement can be extracted from [Sinz, 2005]. It is based on the observation that the sum of the first $j$ elements of the $0/1$ sequence $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ exceeds $k$ if, and only if, either the sum of the first $j-1$ elements already exceeds $k$, or the sum of the first $j-1$ elements is $k$ and the $j$-th element of the sequence is 1. We give the formal proof in an appendix for completeness of the presentation.

**Proposition 2.** *Let $\Phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ be as defined above. Then*

*(i) For any assignment $I : \mathrm{vars}(\Phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n)) \to \{0, 1\}$ such that $I$ satisfies $\Phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$, any $1 \leq j \leq n$ and $1 \leq k \leq n$ we have*

$$I(s_j^k) = 1 \quad \textit{if, and only if,} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{j} I(p_i) \geq k.$$

*(ii) For any $0/1$-sequence $(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \{0, 1\}^n$ there exists an assignment $I : \mathrm{vars}(\Phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n)) \to \{0, 1\}$ such that $I(p_i) = a_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$; $I$ satisfies $\Phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$; and for any $r \leq n$ and $j \leq n$ if $\sum_{i=1}^{j} a_i \leq r$ then $I(s_j^k) = 0$, for $r < k \leq n$.*

It follows from Proposition 2 that the formula $(\Phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n) \wedge \neg s_n^{r+1})$ enforces the cardinality constraint $p_1 + \cdots + p_n \leq r$.

Formula (4) can be equivalently rewritten into clausal form:

$$(\neg s_j^k \vee s_{j-1}^k \vee s_{j-1}^{k-1}) \tag{7}$$

$$(\neg s_j^k \vee s_{j-1}^k \vee p_j) \tag{8}$$

$$(\neg s_{j-1}^k \vee s_j^k) \tag{9}$$

$$(\neg s_{j-1}^{k-1} \vee \neg p_j \vee s_j^k), \tag{10}$$

where $1 \leq k \leq n$, $1 \leq j \leq n$.

Notice that the original encoding in [Sinz, 2005] only contains clauses (9) and (10) due to a polarity-based optimisation based on Tseitin's [1970] renaming techniques. One can see that by unit propagation of clauses (5), (6) and $(\neg s_n^{r+1})$ into (9) and (10) we obtain exactly the set of clauses used in [Sinz, 2005], which consists of $O(nr)$ clauses and requires $O(nr)$ auxiliary propositions. This optimisation leads to a relaxation in item (*i*) of Proposition 2: Suppose that an assignment $I$, which satisfies (5), (6), (9) and (10), is such that $I(p_1) + \cdots + I(p_n) \leq r' < r$. Then the value of $s_n^k$ under $I$ can still be true, as long as $r' < k \leq r$, while not violating the cardinality constraint $p_1 + \ldots p_n \leq r$.

For our purposes we require an unoptimised version of the encoding with a tighter restriction on the values of $s_j^k$ stated in Proposition 2.

# 3 SAT Encoding of the discrepancy problem

We say that a $\pm 1$ sequence $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ is *$C$-bounded*, for some $C > 0$, if $|\sum_{i=1}^{j} x_i| \leq C$, for all $1 \leq j \leq n$. We extend the notion of $C$-boundedness to Boolean $0/1$ sequences using the relation between $\pm 1$ sequences $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ and Boolean $\{0, 1\}$-sequences $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ defined as follows: $x_i = 2p_i - 1$ (in other words, $+1$ is encoded by the Boolean value *true*, and $-1$ is encoded by the Boolean value *false*). Then a $0/1$ sequence $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ is $C$-bounded if for every $j > 0$ the disbalance between the number of 1s in $a_1, \ldots, a_j$ and the number of 0s in $a_1, \ldots, a_j$ is at most $C$.

We build our SAT encoding of the Erdős discrepancy problem on the sequential counter-based encoding of cardinality constraints described in Section 2.3. We illustrate our approach by the following consideration. By Proposition 2, an arbitrary assignment of $0/1$ values to propositions $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ can be uniquely extended to a model of $\Phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$. We denote this model as $I$. Suppose that the value of some $s_j^k$ under $I$ is false. Then, by Proposition 2, the sequence $I(p_1), \ldots, I(p_j)$ contains at most $k-1$ occurrences of 1 and so it contains at least $j-(k-1)$ occurrences of 0. Therefore, the disbalance between the number of occurrences of 0 and the number of occurrences of 1 is at least $j - 2k + 2$. If $j > 2k - 2 + C$ then the sequence $I(p_1), \ldots, I(p_j)$ is not $C$-bounded. Thus, in our encoding of $C$-bounded sequences we need to exclude such a possibility. This can be achieved by conjoining formula $\Phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ with

$$(s_j^k), \quad \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq n \text{ and } 2k - 2 + C < j \leq n. \tag{11}$$

Similarly, if the value of $s_j^k$ is true, for some $j < 2k - C$, then the number of 1s exceeds the number of 0s by more than $C$, so these possibilities should also be excluded by

$$(\neg s_j^k), \quad \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq n \text{ and } 0 \leq j < 2k - C. \tag{12}$$

To summarise, let propositional formula $\Psi^C(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ be the conjunction of $\Phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$, with (11) and (12). Notice that, as in the case of $\Phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$, we write (11) and (12) explicitly for the ease of explanation. The proof of the following theorem can be found in Appendix A.

**Theorem 3.** *For any assignment $I : \{p_1, \ldots, p_n\} \to \{0, 1\}$ the following holds: there exists an extension of $I$ to $I' : \mathrm{vars}(\Psi^C(p_1, \ldots, p_n)) \to \{0, 1\}$ that is a model of $\Psi^C(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ if, and only if, the sequence $I(p_1), \ldots, I(p_n)$ is $C$-bounded.*

As (4) is logically equivalent to the set of clauses (7)–(10), formula $\Psi^C(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ is logically equivalent to the set of clauses $S$ consisting of (7)–(10), (5), (6), (11) and (12). Let $\mathsf{CBound}^C(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ be the result of applying unit propagation to $S$ in an exhaustive manner. One can see that the set $\mathsf{CBound}^C(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ contains less than $C \cdot n$ auxiliary propositions and less than $4C \cdot n$ clauses.

**Example 4.** *We construct $\mathsf{CBound}^2(p_1, \ldots, p_5)$, a clausal representation of the statement that the sequence $p_1, \ldots, p_5$ is 2-bounded. We also demonstrate how clauses (5), (6), (11) and (12) are unit propagated into clauses (7)–(10).*

*Notice that for $k = 1$ every instance of clause (7) contains literal $s_{j-1}^0$, the only literal of the unit clause (6). Thus, every instance of clause (7) for $k = 1$ is redundant.*

*For $k = 2$ and $j = 1$, clause (7) contains $\neg s_1^2$, the only literal of the unit clause (5), so for $k = 2$ and $j = 1$, the instance of clause (7) is also redundant.*

*For $k = 2$ and $j = 2$, an instance of the unit clause (5), namely $\neg s_1^2$, unit propagates into (7) resulting in a 2-CNF clause $(\neg s_2^2 \vee s_1^1)$.*

*For $k = 2$ and $j = 3$, (7) instantiates to $(\neg s_3^2 \vee s_2^2 \vee s_2^1)$.*

*Finally, for $k = 2$ and for $4 \leq j \leq 5$, clause (7) contains $s_{j-1}^1$, the only literal of the unit clause (11). Thus, for $k = 2$ and $4 \leq j \leq 5$ the instances of clause (7) are redundant.*

*By a further consideration of cases, one can see that the set of all non-redundant simplified instance of clause (7), for $1 \leq k \leq 5$ and $j \leq j \leq 5$, consists of*

$$\begin{array}{ll} (\neg s_2^2 \vee s_1^1) & (\neg s_4^3 \vee s_3^2) \\ (\neg s_3^2 \vee s_2^2 \vee s_2^1) & (\neg s_5^3 \vee s_4^3 \vee s_4^2). \end{array} \tag{13}$$

*We group here the clauses in such a way that all clauses in one column correspond to the same value of the parameter $k$.*

*Similarly, instances of clause (8), for $1 \leq k \leq 5$ and $1 \leq j \leq 5$ are simplified with the help of unit clause (5), (6), (11) and (12) to*

$$\begin{array}{lll} (\neg s_1^1 \vee p_1) & (\neg s_2^2 \vee p_2) & (\neg s_4^3 \vee p_4) \\ (\neg s_2^1 \vee s_1^1 \vee p_2) & (\neg s_3^2 \vee s_2^2 \vee p_3) & (\neg s_5^3 \vee s_4^3 \vee p_5). \\ (s_2^1 \vee p_3) & (\neg s_4^2 \vee s_3^2 \vee p_4) & \\ & (s_3^2 \vee p_5) & \end{array} \tag{14}$$

*The set of all non-redundant simplified instances of clause (9) consists of*

$$\begin{array}{lll} (\neg s_1^1 \vee s_2^1) & (\neg s_2^2 \vee s_3^2) & (\neg s_4^3 \vee s_5^3) \\ & (\neg s_3^2 \vee s_4^2) & \end{array} \tag{15}$$

*and set of all non-redundant simplified instances of clause (10) consists of*

$$\begin{array}{llll} (\neg p_1 \vee s_1^1) & (\neg s_1^1 \vee \neg p_2 \vee s_2^2) & (\neg s_2^2 \vee \neg p_3) & (\neg s_4^3 \vee \neg p_5). \\ (\neg p_2 \vee s_2^1) & (\neg s_2^1 \vee \neg p_3 \vee s_3^2) & (\neg s_3^2 \vee \neg p_4 \vee s_4^3) & \\ & (\neg p_4 \vee s_4^2) & (\neg s_4^2 \vee \neg p_5 \vee s_5^3) & \end{array} \tag{16}$$

*Thus, the set $\mathsf{CBound}^2(p_1, \ldots, p_5)$ consists of 26 clauses grouped in (13)–(16) above.*

Any $\pm 1$-sequence containing less than or equal to $C$ elements is always $C$-bounded. It should be clear then that the discrepancy of a $\pm 1$ sequence $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ is bounded by $C$ if, and only if, for every $d : 1 \leq d \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{C+1} \rfloor$ the subsequence $x_d, x_{2d} \ldots, x_{\lfloor n/d \rfloor \cdot d}$ is $C$-bounded. Then we define

$$\mathsf{edp}(C, n) = \bigwedge_{d=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{C+1} \rfloor} \mathsf{CBound}^C(p_d, p_{2d}, \ldots, p_{\lfloor n/d \rfloor \cdot d}). \tag{17}$$

We assume here that for the different values of $d$ sets $\mathsf{CBound}^C(p_d, x_{2d}, \ldots, p_{\lfloor n/d \rfloor \cdot d})$ share the same input propositions $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ but use different auxiliary propositions $s_j^k$. Then the following theorem is a direct consequence of Theorem 3

**Theorem 5.** *For any assignment $I : \{p_1, \ldots, p_n\} \to \{0, 1\}$ the following holds: there exists an extension of $I$ to $I' : \mathrm{vars}(\mathsf{edp}(C, n)) \to \{0, 1\}$ that is a model of $\mathsf{edp}(C, n)$ if, and only if, $I(p_1), \ldots, I(p_n)$ encodes a $\pm 1$ sequence $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ of length $n$ and discrepancy at most $C$.*

We conclude this section with a description of two optimisations, which we present in the form of propositions. Both reduce significantly the size of the unsatisfiability certificate and have some noticeable effect on the running time. The first optimisation allows one to remove the 'don't care' propositions, which do not affect the satisfiability of the problem. The second optimisation breaks the symmetry in the problem.

**Proposition 6.** *Suppose that a sequence $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ is $C$-bounded and either $n$ is odd and $C$ is even or $n$ is even and $C$ is odd. Then for an arbitrary value $b$ the sequence $a_1, \ldots, a_n, b$ is $C$-bounded.*

*Proof.* It suffices to notice that $|\sum_{i=1}^{j} a_i|$ is odd if, and only if, $j$ is odd. Thus, under the conditions of the proposition, $|\sum_{i=1}^{j} a_i| \leq C-1$, and the sequence can be extended arbitrarily. □

**Proposition 7.** *There exists a $\pm 1$ sequence $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ of length $n$ and discrepancy at most $C$ if, and only if, there exists a $\pm 1$ sequence $y_1, \ldots, y_n$ of length $n$ and discrepancy at most $C$, in which $y_l = 1$, for some arbitrary but fixed value of $l$.*

*Proof.* The problem is symmetric, that is, the discrepancy of $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ is bounded by $C$ if, and only if, the discrepancy of $-x_1, \ldots, -x_n$ is bounded by $C$. □

## 3.1 SAT Encoding of Multiplicativity

Multiplicativity and complete multiplicativity of $\pm 1$ sequences can be encoded in SAT in a rather straightforward way. Assuming that a Boolean sequence $p_1, \ldots p_n$ encodes a $\pm 1$ sequence $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ so that the logical value 1 encodes the numerical value $+1$ and the logical value 0 encodes the numerical value $-1$, a SAT encoding of the fact that $x_{j \cdot k} = x_j \cdot x_k$ is captured by the following clauses, which enumerate all four combinations of values of $x_j$ and $x_k$:

$$\mathsf{prod}_{j,k} = \{(\neg p_j \vee \neg p_k \vee p_{j \cdot k}), (p_j \vee p_k \vee p_{j \cdot k}), (\neg p_j \vee p_k \vee \neg p_{j \cdot k}), (p_j \vee \neg p_k \vee \neg p_{j \cdot k})\} \tag{18}$$

Then multiplicativity of $x_1, \ldots x_n$ is captured by instances of (18) for all coprime pairs $i$ and $j$; and, by (2), complete multiplicativity of the sequence $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ is captured by instances of (18) for $j$ and $k$ such that every product $j \cdot k$ is generated only once.

For complete multiplicativity further optimisation is possible due to the fact that in any such sequence $x_{j^2} = +1$ for any $j \in \mathbb{N}^+$. It can be seen that the CNF formula $\mathsf{cmult}_i$ defined below expresses the complete multiplicativity condition on $i$, for every $i : 1 \leq i \leq n$.

$$\mathsf{cmult}_i = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } i \text{ is prime} \\ \{(p_i)\} & \text{if } i = j^2, \text{ for some } j \geq 1 \\ \mathsf{prod}_{j,k} & \text{if none of the cases above applies} \\ & \text{and } j, k \text{ are some non-trivial divisors of } i. \end{cases}$$

Then we define two sets of clauses

$$\mathsf{edp_m}(C,n) = \mathsf{edp}(C,n) \cup \bigcup_{\substack{1<j\le n, 1<k\le n \\ j,k \text{ are coprime} \\ j\cdot k\le n}} \mathsf{prod}_{j,k}$$

and

$$\mathsf{edp_{cm}}(C,n) = \mathsf{edp}(C,n) \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \mathsf{cmult}_i.$$

The following statement is a direct consequence of Theorem 5.

**Theorem 8.** *For any assignment $I : \{p_1, \ldots, p_n\} \to \{0,1\}$ the following holds: there exists an extension of $I$ to $I' : \mathrm{vars}(\mathsf{edp_m}(C,n)) \to \{0,1\}$ (or an extension of $I$ to $I' : \mathrm{vars}(\mathsf{edp_{cm}}(C,n)) \to \{0,1\}$), which is a model of $\mathsf{edp_m}(C,n)$ (or $\mathsf{edp_{cm}}(C,n)$, respectively) if, and only if, $I(p_1), \ldots, I(p_n)$ encodes a multiplicative (or completely multiplicative, respectively) $\pm 1$ sequence $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ of length $n$ and discrepancy at most $C$.*

Finally we notice that the completely multiplicative case can be optimised based on the following observation.

**Proposition 9.** *The discrepancy of a completely multiplicative $\pm 1$ sequence $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ is bounded by $C$, for some $C > 0$, if, and only if, $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ is $C$-bounded.*

*Proof.* The necessary condition is trivial by definition of discrepancy. For the sufficient condition we show that for any $C$-bounded sequence $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ and any $d > 1$ the subsequence $x_d, x_{2d}, \ldots, x_{\lfloor n/d \rfloor \cdot d}$ is $C$-bounded. Let $1 \le j \le \lfloor n/d \rfloor$. Then $|\sum_{i=1}^{j} x_{i\cdot d}| = |\sum_{i=1}^{j} (x_i \cdot x_d)| = |x_d \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{j} x_i| = |\sum_{i=1}^{j} x_i| \le C$. □

# 4 Results

In our experiments we use `Treengeling`, a parallel cube-and-conquer flavour of the `Lingeling` SAT solver [Biere, 2013] version aqw, the winner of the *SAT-UNSAT* category of the SAT'13 competition [Balint *et al.*, 2013], and the `Glucose` solver [Audemard and Simon, 2013] version 3.0, the winner of the *certified UNSAT* category of the SAT'13 competition [Balint *et al.*, 2013]. All experiments were conducted on PCs equipped with an Intel Core i5-2500K CPU running at 3.30GHz and 16GB of RAM.

In our first series of experiments we investigate the discrepancy of unrestricted $\pm 1$ sequences. We encode[2] the existence of a $\pm 1$ discrepancy $C$ sequence of length $n$ into SAT as described in Section 3. We deploy both optimisations described in Proposition 6 and Proposition 7. We choose as $l$, for which we fix $x_l$ to be $+1$, colossally abundant numbers [Alaoglu and Erdős, 1944], which have many divisors and thus contribute to many homogeneous sequences. Specifically for $C = 2$, the choice of $l = 120$ is more beneficial for satisfiable instances; however, $l = 60$ results in a better reduction of the size of the unsatisfiability proof described below. For consistency of presentation, we use $l = 60$ in all our experiments for $C = 2$.

[2]The problem generator and results can be found at `http://www.csc.liv.ac.uk/~konev/edp/`

For $C = 2$ we establish that the maximal length of a $\pm 1$ sequence of discrepancy 2 is $1160$. The CNF formula $\mathsf{edp}(2, 1160)$ contains $11824$ propositions and $41\,884$ clauses. It takes the `Treengeling` system about $430$ seconds to find an example of such a sequence on our hardware configuration. One of the sequences of length $1160$ of discrepancy $2$ can be found in Appendix B.

When applied to the CNF formula $\mathsf{edp}(2, 1161)$, which contains $11847$ propositions and $41\,970$ clauses, `Treengeling` reports unsatisfiability. In order to corroborate this statement, we also use `Glucose`. It takes the solver about $800$ seconds to generate a DRUP certificate of unsatisfiability. The correctness of the generated unsatisfiability certificate has been independently verified with the `drup-trim` tool [Heule *et al.*, 2013].

The size of the certificate is about 1.67 GB, and the time needed to verify the certificate is comparable with the time needed to generate it. The RUP unsatisfiability certificate, that is the DRUP certificate with all information on the deleted clauses stripped, is $850.2$MB; it takes `drup-trim` about five and a half hours to verify it. Combined with Theorem 5, these two experiments yield a computer proof of the following statement.

**Theorem 10.** *The length of a maximal* $\pm 1$ *sequence of discrepancy* $2$ *is* $1160$.

Thus we prove that the Erdős discrepancy conjecture holds true for $C = 2$.

When applied to $\mathsf{edp}(3, n)$ for increasing values of $n$ our method could only produce sequences of discrepancy $3$ of length in the region of $14\,000$, even though solvers were allowed to run for weeks. Since both multiplicativity and complete multiplicativity restrictions reduce severely the search space, in hope for better performance, we perform the second series of experiments to investigate the discrepancy bound for multiplicative and completely multiplicative sequences. Notice that the optimisation described in Proposition 7 is not applicable in this case as the fact that $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ is multiplicative does not imply that $-x_1, \ldots, -x_n$ is.

We saw in Example 1 that multiplicative sequences of discrepancy $1$ are longer than completely multiplicative sequences. The longest completely multiplicative sequence of discrepancy $2$ is known to contain $246$ elements [Polymath, 2011]; tests with $\mathsf{edp}_{\mathsf{m}}$ show that the longest multiplicative sequence of discrepancy $2$ has $344$ elements. Thus it wouldn't be unreasonable to assume that the longest multiplicative discrepancy $3$ sequence is longer than the longest completely multiplicative one, but is probably harder to find. It turns out that this expectation is wrong on both accounts.

We establish that the length of a maximal $\pm 1$ completely multiplicative discrepancy $3$ sequence coincides with the length of a maximal $\pm 1$ multiplicative discrepancy $3$ sequence and is equal to $127\,645$. It takes `Treengeling` about one hour and fifty minutes to find a satisfying assignment to $\mathsf{edp}_{\mathsf{cm}}(3, 127\,645)$, which contains $3\,484\,084$ propositions and $13\,759\,785$ clauses, and about one hour and thirty five minutes to find a satisfying assignment to $\mathsf{edp}_{\mathsf{m}}(3, 127\,645)$, which also contains $3\,484\,084$ propositions but $14\,813\,052$ clauses.

It takes the `Glucose` solver just under eight hours to generate an approximately 1.95 GB DRUP proof of unsatisfiability for $\mathsf{edp}_{\mathsf{cm}}(3, 127\,646)$, which contains $3\,484\,084$ propositions and $13\,759\,809$ clauses, and about nine and a half hours to generate an approximately 3.78 GB DRUP proof of unsatisfiability for $\mathsf{edp}_{\mathsf{m}}(3, 127\,646)$, which again contains the same number of propositions but $14\,813\,076$ clauses.

| Discrepancy bound | Completely multiplicative | Multiplicative | Unconstrained |
|---|---|---|---|
| C = 1 | 9 | **11** | **11** |
| C = 2 | 246 | 344 | 1160 |
| C = 3 | **127 645** | **127 645** | $>$130 000 |

Table 1: Maximal length of $\pm 1$ sequences of bounded discrepancy

The optimisation of Proposition 9 leads reduction in the problem size for the completely multiplicative case (446 753 propositions and 1 738 125 clauses for length 127 645 and 446 759 propositions and 1 738 149 clauses for length 127 646) and a significant reduction in the `Treengeling` running time (about 20 and 30 minutes, respectively); however, it does not reduce the size of the DRUP certificate for the unsatisfiable case, which is about 2.22 GB. This lack of reduction in size is due to the fact that unit propagation steps are not recorded as part of a DRUP certificate.

So we get a computer-aided proof of another sharp bound on the sizes of maximal sequences of bounded discrepancy.

**Theorem 11.** *The length of a maximal multiplicative* $\pm 1$ *sequence of discrepancy* 3 *equals to the length of a maximal completely multiplicative* $\pm 1$ *sequence of discrepancy* 3 *and is* $127\,645$.

Unrestricted sequences of discrepancy $3$ can still be longer than $127\,646$: by requiring that only first $127\,600$ elements of a sequence are completely multiplicative, we generate a 130,000 long EDP3 sequence in about one hour and fifty minutes thus establishing a slightly better lower bound on the length of $\pm 1$ sequences of discrepancy $3$ than the one from Theorem 11. The solvers struggle to expand it much further. Notice that the optimisation of Proposition 9 is not applicable here.

We summarise known facts about discrepancy of unrestricted, multiplicative and completely multiplicative sequences in Table 1. We highlight in boldface cases where the lengths of maximal sequences of different kinds are equal.

# 5 Conclusions

We have demonstrated that SAT-based methods can be used to tackle the longstanding mathematical questions related to discrepancy of $\pm 1$ sequences. Not only were we able to identify the exact boundary between satisfiability and unsatisfiability of the encoding of the EDP for $C = 2$, thus identifying the longest sequences of discrepancy $2$, but also we have established the surprising fact that the lengths of the longest multiplicative and completely multiplicative sequences of discrepancy $3$ coincide. The latter result helps to establish a novel lower bound on the length of the longest discrepancy $3$ sequence.

There is, however, a noticeable asymmetry in our findings. The fact that a sequence of length 1160 has discrepancy $2$ can be relatively easily checked manually. It is harder but not impossible to verify the correctness of the discrepancy bound for $127\,645$-long sequences. On the other hand, even though improvements to our method shortened the

Wikipedia-size 13 GB proof reported in [Konev and Lisitsa, 2014a] more than tenfold passing thus the psychological barrier of 1 GB, it is still probably one of the longest proofs of a non-trivial mathematical result, and it is equally improbable that a mathematician would verify by hand ten billions or half a billion of automatically generated proof lines. It should be noted that this gigantic proof is a formal proof in a well-specified proof system and, as such, it has been verified by a third-party tool, and it can potentially be translated into a proof assistant such as Coq [Armand *et al.*, 2011]. The reduction of proof size will be useful for any future analysis of the proof in an attempt to identify patterns and lemmas and produce a compact proof more amenable for human comprehension.

**Acknowledgements** The authors would like to thank Armin Biere, Marijn Heule, Pascal Fontaine, Laurent Simon and Laurent Théry and Donald Knuth for helpful discussions, comments and ideas following the publication of the preliminary version of this paper [Konev and Lisitsa, 2014a].

# References

[Alaoglu and Erdős, 1944] Leonidas Alaoglu and Paul Erdős. On highly composite and similar numbers. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 56(3):448–469, 1944.

[Alon, 1992] Noga Alon. Transmitting in the *n*-dimensional cube. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 37/38:9–11, 1992.

[Apostol, 1976] Tom M. Apostol. *Introduction to analytic number theory*. Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, New York, NY, USA, 1976.

[Armand *et al.*, 2011] Michaël Armand, Germain Faure, Benjamin Grégoire, Chantal Keller, Laurent Théry, and Benjamin Werner. A modular integration of SAT/SMT solvers to coq through proof witnesses. In Jean-Pierre Jouannaud and Zhong Shao, editors, *Certified Programs and Proofs - First International Conference, CPP 2011, Kenting, Taiwan, December 7-9, 2011. Proceedings*, volume 7086 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 135–150. Springer, 2011.

[Audemard and Simon, 2013] Gilles Audemard and Laurent Simon. Glucose 2.3 in the SAT 2013 Competition. In *Proceedings of SAT Competition 2013*, pages 42–43, Helsinki, 2013. University of Helsinki.

[Balint *et al.*, 2013] Adrian Balint, Anton Belov, Marijn J. H. Heule, and Matti Järvisalo, editors. *Proceedings of SAT competition 2013*. University of Helsinki, 2013.

[Beck and Chen, 1987] József Beck and William W. L. Chen. *Irregularities of Distribution*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987.

[Beck and Sós, 1995] Józef Beck and Vera T. Sós. Discrepancy theory. In Ronald. L. Graham, Martin Grötschel, and László Lovász, editors, *Handbook of combinatorics*, volume 2, pages 1405–1446. Elsivier, Amsterdam, 1995.

[Biere *et al.*, 2009] Armin Biere, Marijn Heule, Hans van Maaren, and Toby Walsh, editors. *Handbook of Satisfiability*, volume 185 of *Fronteers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*. IOS Press, Amsterdam, 2009.

[Biere, 2013] Armin Biere. Lingeling, Plingeling and Treengeling entering the SAT Competition 2013. In *Proceedings of SAT Competition 2013*, pages 51–52, Helsinki, 2013. University of Helsinki.

[Borwein *et al.*, 2010] Peter Borwein, Stephen K. K. Choi, and Michael Coons. Completely multiplicative functions taking values in $\{1, -1\}$. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 362(12):6279–6291, 2010.

[Chazelle, 2000] Bernard Chazelle. *The Discrepancy Method: Randomness and Complexity*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2000.

[Erdős, 1957] Paul Erdős. Some unsolved problems. *The Michigan Mathematical Journal*, 4(3):291–300, 1957.

[Goldberg and Novikov, 2003] Evguenii I. Goldberg and Yakov Novikov. Verification of proofs of unsatisfiability for CNF formulas. In *Proceedings of Design, Automation and Test in Europe Conference and Exposition (DATE 2003), 3-7 March 2003, Munich, Germany*, pages 10886–10891, 2003.

[Gowers, 2009] Timothy Gowers. Is massively collaborative mathematics possible?, 2009. Retrieved April, 10 2014 from `http://gowers.wordpress.com/2009/01/27/is-massively-collaborative-mathematics-`

[Gowers, 2013] Timothy Gowers. Erdős and arithmetic progressoins. In *Erdős Centennial conference*, 2013. Retrieved April, 10 2014 from `http://www.renyi.hu/conferences/erdos100/program.html`

[Heule *et al.*, 2013] Marijn Heule, Warren A. Hunt Jr., and Nathan Wetzler. Trimming while checking clausal proofs. In *Proceedings of Formal Methods in Computer-Aided Design, FMCAD 2013*, pages 181–188. IEEE, 2013.

[Konev and Lisitsa, 2014a] Boris Konev and Alexei Lisitsa. A SAT attack on the Erdős discrepancy conjecture. *CoRR*, abs/1402.2184, 2014.

[Konev and Lisitsa, 2014b] Boris Konev and Alexei Lisitsa. A SAT attack on the Erdős discrepancy conjecture. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing, SAT 2014*, 2014. To appear.

[Mathias, 1993] A. R. D. Mathias. On a conjecture of Erdős and Čudakov. Combinatorics, geometry and probability, 1993.

[Matoušek and Spencer, 1996] Jiří Matoušek and Joel Spencer. Discrepancy in arithmetic progressions. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 9(1):195–204, 1996.

[Matoušek, 1999] Jiří Matoušek. *Geometric Discrepancy: An Illustrated Guide*, volume 18 of *Algorithms and combinatorics*. Springer, 1999.

[Muthukrishnan and Nikolov, 2012] S. Muthukrishnan and Aleksandar Nikolov. Optimal private halfspace counting via discrepancy. In *Proceedings of the 44th Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '12, pages 1285–1292, New York, NY, USA, 2012. ACM.

[Nikolov and Talwar, 2013] Aleksandar Nikolov and Kunal Talwar. On the hereditary discrepancy of homogeneous arithmetic progressions. *CoRR*, abs/1309.6034v1, 2013.

[Polymath, 2010] D.H.J. Polymath. Erdős discrepancy problem: Polymath wiki, 2010. Retrieved April, 10 2014 from `http://michaelnielsen.org/polymath1/index.php?title=The_Erdős_discrepancy_prob`

[Polymath, 2011] D.H.J. Polymath. Human proof that completely multiplicative sequences have discrepancy greater than 2, 2011. Retrieved April, 10 2014 from `http://michaelnielsen.org/polymath1/index.php?title=Human_proof_that_completel`

[Rautenberg, 2010] Wolfgang Rautenberg. *A Concise Introduction to Mathematical Logic*. Springer, New York, 3 edition, 2010.

[Roth, 1964] Klaus F. Roth. Remark concerning integer sequence. *Acta Arithmetica*, 9:257–260, 1964.

[Roussel and Manquinho, 2009] Olivier Roussel and Vasco M. Manquinho. Pseudo-boolean and cardinality constraints. In Armin Biere, Marijn Heule, Hans van Maaren, and Toby Walsh, editors, *Handbook of Satisfiability*, volume 185 of *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, pages 695–733. IOS Press, Amsterdam, 2009.

[Sinz, 2005] Carsten Sinz. Towards an optimal CNF encoding of boolean cardinality constraints. In *Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming - CP 2005, 11th International Conference, CP 2005, Sitges, Spain, October 1-5, 2005, Proceedings*, volume 3709 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 827–831. Springer, 2005.

[Tseitin, 1970] Grigory S. Tseitin. On the complexity of derivation in propositional calculus. In Anatol O. Slisenko, editor, *Studies in Constructive Mathematics and Mathematical Logic, Part 2*, pages 115–125, New York, 1970. Consultants Bureau.

[Čudakov, 1956] Nikolai Čudakov. Theory of the characters of number semigroups. *Journal of Indian Mathematical Society*, 20:11–15, 1956.

# A Proofs of technical results

In this section we give proofs of the technical results used in the main text. We re-state propositions and theorems here for the reader's convenience.

PROPOSITION 2. *Let $\Phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ be as defined above. Then*

*(i) For any assignment $I : \mathrm{vars}(\Phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n)) \to \{0, 1\}$ such that $I$ satisfies $\Phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$, any $1 \leq j \leq n$ and $1 \leq k \leq n$ we have*

$$I(s_j^k) = 1 \quad \textit{if, and only if,} \qquad \sum_{i=1}^{j} I(p_i) \geq k.$$

*(ii) For any $0/1$-sequence $(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \{0, 1\}^n$ there exists an assignment $I : \mathrm{vars}(\Phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n)) \to \{0, 1\}$ such that $I(p_i) = a_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$; $I$ satisfies $\Phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$; and for any $r \leq n$ and $j \leq n$ if $\sum_{i=1}^{j} a_i \leq r$ then $I(s_j^k) = 0$, for $r < k \leq n$.*

*Proof.* (i) The proof proceeds by induction on the lexicographical partial order $\prec$ on pairs of non-negative integers: $(j, k) \prec (j', k')$ iff $j < j' \vee ((j = j') \wedge (k < k'))$. Fix some $n \geq 1$.

Consider cases:

- Suppose that $j = k = 1$. Then formula (4), one of the conjuncts of $\Phi^n(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$, instantiates to $s_1^1 \leftrightarrow (s_0^1 \vee (s_0^0 \wedge p_1)$. Therefore, for an assignment $I$ such that $I$ satisfies $\Phi^n(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ we have $I(s_1^1 \leftrightarrow (s_0^1 \vee (s_0^0 \wedge p_1)) = 1$. Furthermore, for the satisfying assignment we have $I(s_0^1) = 0$ and $I(s_0^0) = 1$. It follows then that $I(s_1^1) = I(p_1)$, which is equivalent to the statement of the proposition for the case $k = j = 1$.
- Suppose that $j = 1$ and $k > 1$. For a satisfying assignment $I$ we have $I(s_1^k) = 0$ (as (5) is a conjunct of $\Phi^n(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$). On the other hand for $k > 1$ we have $\sum_{i=1}^{1} I(p_i) < k$. Thus the statement of the proposition holds true in this case.
- Suppose that $j > 1$, $k \geq 1$. For a satisfying assignment $I$ we have $I(s_j^k) = 1$ if and only if $I(s_{j-1}^k) = 1$ or $I(s_{j-1}^{k-1} \wedge p_j) = 1$ (by satisfaction of (4)). By induction hypothesis the later is equivalent to $\sum_{i=1}^{j-1} I(p_i) \geq k$ or $\sum_{i=1}^{j-1} I(p_i) \geq k - 1$ and $I(p_j) = 1$, which in turn is equivalent to $\sum_{i=1}^{j} I(p_i) \geq k$.

(ii) First notice that any assignment $I_p : \{p_1, \ldots, p_n) \to \{0, 1\}$ can be extended in a unique way to the assignment $I : \mathrm{vars}(\Phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n)) \to \{0, 1\}$. Indeed, satisfaction of (5) and (6) defines uniquely the values of satisfying assignment $I$ on $s_j^k$ for the cases $0 \leq j < k \leq n$ and $k = 0; 0 \leq j \leq n$, respectively. Further, using satisfaction condition for (4) the values of $I$ on the remaining variables $s_j^k$ with $1 \leq k \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq n$ are defined uniquely by induction on $\prec$. The

remaining condition, that is for any $r \leq n$ and $j \leq n$ if $\sum_{i=1}^{j} a_i \leq r$ then $I(s_j^k) = 0$, for $r < k \leq n$, now follows from item (*i*) above.

□

THEOREM 3. *For any assignment $I : \{p_1, \ldots, p_n\} \to \{0,1\}$ the following holds: there exists an extension of $I$ to $I' : \mathrm{vars}(\Psi^C(p_1, \ldots, p_n)) \to \{0,1\}$ that is a model of $\Psi^C(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ if, and only if, the sequence $I(p_1), \ldots, I(p_n)$ is $C$-bounded.*

*Proof.* $\Longleftarrow$ Assume that for an assignment $I : \{p_1, \ldots, p_n\} \to \{0,1\}$ the sequence $I(p_1), \ldots, I(p_n)$ is $C$-bounded. By item (*ii*) of Proposition 2, $I$ can be extended to an assignment $I' : vars(\Phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n) \to \{0,1\}$ such that $I'(p_i) = I(p_i)$, for all $1 \leq i \leq n$; $I'$ satisfies $\Phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$; and, furthermore, $I'(s_j^k) = 1$ if, and only if, $\sum_{i=1}^{j} I'(p_i) \geq k$. We show that $I'$ is, in fact, a model of $\Psi^C(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$. It suffices to demonstrate that clauses (11) and (12) are true under $I'$.

1. Assume to the contrary that $I'(s_j^k) = 0$, for some $1 \leq k \leq n$ and $2k - 2 + C < j \leq n$. Then by Proposition 2 we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{j} I'(p_i) < k. \tag{19}$$

   As the number of occurrences of 1 in $I'(p_1), \ldots, I'(p_n)$ is $\sum_{i=1}^{j} I'(p_i)$ (and, hence, the number of occurrences of 0 in $I'(p_1), \ldots, I'(p_n)$ is $\sum_{i=1}^{j}(1-I'(p_i))$), the difference between the number of occurrences of 0 and the number of occurrences of 1 is at least $\sum_{i=1}^{j}(1 - I'(p_i)) - \sum_{i=1}^{j} I'(p_i) = j - 2\sum_{i=1}^{j} I'(p_i)$.

   As we supposed that $j > 2k - 2 + C$, the difference between the number of occurrences of 0 and the number of occurrences of 1 exceeds $2k - 2 + C - 2\sum_{i=1}^{j} I'(p_i) \geq 2k-2+C-2(k-1) = C$ (by (19)) and therefore the sequence $I'(p_1), \ldots, I'(p_n)$ and hence $I(p_1), \ldots, I(p_n)$ is not $C$-bounded contradicting our assumption.

2. Assume to the contrary that $I'(s_j^k) = 1$ for some $1 \leq k \leq n$ and $0 \leq j < 2k - C$. Then $\sum_{i=1}^{j} I'(p_i) \geq k$ (by Proposition 2) Now we estimate the difference between the number of occurrences of 1 in $I'(p_1) \ldots I'(p_n)$ and the number of occurrences of 0 in $I'(p_1) \ldots I'(p_n)$. We have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{j} I'(p_i) - \sum_{i=1}^{j}(1-I'(p_i)) = 2(\sum_{i=1}^{j} I'(p_i)) - j \geq 2k - j > 2k - (2k - C) = C.$$

   It follows that the sequence $I(p_1), \ldots, I(p_n)$ is not $C$-bounded contradicting our assumption.

$\Longrightarrow$ Consider an assignment $I : \{p_1, \ldots, p_n\} \to \{0,1\}$ and assume that its extension to $I' : vars(\Psi^C(p_1, \ldots, p_n)) \to \{0,1\}$ is a model of $\Psi^C(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$. Now

we are to show that $I(p_i), \ldots, I(p_n)$ is $C$-bounded. Assume to the contrary that it is not $C$-bounded. As $I'$ is an extension of $I$ we have that $I'(p_i), \ldots, I'(p_n)$ is also not $C$-bounded. Then we have $\sum_{i=1}^{j} I'(p_j) > C$ for some $j$. Consider two cases:

1. The number of occurrences of 1 in $I'(p_i)$, for $1 \leq i \leq j$, exceeds the number of occurrences of 0 by more than $C$. Let $\sum_{i=1}^{j} I'(p_i) = k$. Then we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{j} I'(p_i) - \sum_{i=1}^{j} (1 - I'(p_i)) > C,$$

that is $k - j + k > C$ and $j < 2k - C$. Now we have $I'(s_j^k) = 0$, by the satisfaction condition for (11), and $I'(s_j^k) = 1$, by $\sum_{i=1}^{j} I'(p_i) = k$. A contradiction.

2. The number of occurrences of 0 in $I'(p_i)$, for $1 \leq i \leq j$, exceeds the number of occurrences of 1 by more than $C$. Let $\sum_{i=1}^{j} I'(p_i) = k - 1$. Then we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{j} (1 - I'(p_i)) - \sum_{i=1}^{j} I'(p_i) > C,$$

that is, $j - 2(k-1) > C$ and $j - 2k + 2 > C$. Then, by the satisfaction condition for (12), we have $I'(s_j^k) = 1$ and, $\sum_{i=1}^{j} I'(p_i) = k - 1$, we have $I'(s_j^k) = 0$. A contradiction.

□

# B A sequence of length 1160 and discrepancy 2

We give a graphical representation of one of the sequences of length 1160 obtained from the satisfying assignment computed with the `Treengeling` solver. Here $+$ stands for $+1$ and $-$ for $-1$, respectively.

```
- + + - + - - + + - + + - + - - + - - + + - + - - + - - +
+ - + - - + + - + + - + - + + - - + + - + - + - - - + - + + -
+ - - + - - + + + + - - + - - + + - + - - + + - + + - - -
- + + - + + - + - + + - - + + - + - + - - - + + - + - - +
+ - + + - + - - + + - + - - + - - - + - + + - + - - + + -
+ + - + - - + - - + + - + + - + - - + + - + - - + + + - +
- + - - - - + + + - + - - + - - + + + - - - + + - + + - +
- - + - - + + + - - + - + - + - - + - + + + - + + - + - -
+ - - + + - + - - - + + - + + - + - - + - - + + - - + + + -
- - + + + - + - - - + + - + - - + + - - + - + - - + - + +
+ - + - - + + - + + - + - - + + - + - - + - - + + - + - -
+ + - - + - + + - + - + - - + - + - + + - + - - + + - + -
- + - - + + - + - + - + + - + - + - + + - - - + - + - - +
+ + + - - + - - - + + - + - + + - + - - + + - + - - + - -
```